

**Harbors Project Evaluation Criteria**

	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(-3)</b>	<b>(-5)</b>
<b>1. Safety</b>  Weighting: 5	Project is needed for critical safety reasons. Correcting hazards and deficiencies, or harbors of refuge that will reduce loss of life in the Alaska Peninsula, Aleutian Chain region.	Project improves safety of facility by reducing potential hazards and personal injury claims.	Project has no impact on safety	N/A	N/A
<b>2. Maintenance Cost Impact</b>  Weighting: 3	Deferred maintenance projects that substantially reduce maintenance cost to the State, or local government. New projects that provide substantial protection to existing facilities in exposed locations having a history of high damage and maintenance cost.	Deferred maintenance project that moderately reduces maintenance costs to State or local government. New projects that provide moderate breakwater protection to existing facilities in exposed locations.	Project will increase net maintenance cost to State and/or local government.	N/A	N/A
<b>3. Operational Importance</b> of harbor component to be repaired, rehabilitated, constructed. (No score for new projects in this category.) Weighting: 4	Component critical to operation of facility such as approach, gangway and floats.	Important, but not critical, components such as grids, water, electrical system, capacity improvements. Improvements that change function and provide more capacity.	Upland facilities (work floats, restrooms, harbor master offices, parking lots.) Improvements that change function but do not add moorage capacity.	N/A	N/A
<b>4. Effective service life</b> of repaired, rehabilitated, or constructed component.  Weighting: 3	Greater than 15 years	between 15 and 10	between 5 and 10	less than 5 years	N/A

## Harbors Project Evaluation Criteria

Standards	Scoring Criteria				
	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
<b>5. Deficiency as percentage of replacement cost of facility being repaired.</b>  Weighting: 4	Deficiency rating higher than 20%	Deficiency rating higher than 5%	Deficiency rating less than 5%	N/A	N/A
<b>6. New Harbor Capacity</b>  Weighting: 4	Project will increase capacity to meet waiting list demand (over 30% of existing community capacity). No existing facility in community.	Project will increase capacity to meet waiting list demand (over 15% of existing community harbor capacity.)	Project will not increase harbor capacity	N/A	Project will reduce harbor capacity.
<b>7. Economic impacts of project.</b>  Weighting: 3	Supports significant new, identifiable, permanent economic opportunities or benefits statewide. Predominantly a commercial harbor. Improvement projects that preserve significant economic benefits. COE calculated B/C ratio of 1.5 or greater.	Supports moderate new, identifiable, permanent economic opportunities or benefits regionally or locally. More than 30% commercial. Preserves economic benefits. COE calculated B/C ratio of 1.0 or greater.	Supports minimal, speculative or temporary economic opportunities or benefits. Provides or preserves nominal benefits.	N/A	N/A
<b>8. Local interest in project.</b>  Weighting: 2	Resolution of support from local government, project and in official state/local plans. Desire for local ownership and operation included in resolution if a state owned facility. Commitment of substantial financial participation in project.	Letter(s) from local or borough government in support of project; may be in state/local plans and includes a commitment for local management and operation.	Projects with no indication of support.	N/A	N/A

**Harbors Project Evaluation Criteria**

<b>Scoring Criteria</b>					
<b>Standards</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(-3)</b>	<b>(-5)</b>
<b>9. Environmental and project development.</b>  Weighting: 2	Project has or is likely to receive a FONSI, or has a permit in place; Is likely to be covered by the nationwide permit for maintenance, or a completed environmental impact statement indicating project has advanced beyond concept and feasibility.	Project is in feasibility but not advanced enough to distinguish environmental status. Repair and replacement project that changes basic activity at facility but likely to be found acceptable.	New project with little or no environmental information available.	Project likely to have minor issues that may or may not be mitigated and found acceptable.	Project likely to have major issues that may or may not be mitigated and found acceptable.
<b>10. General fund contribution.</b>  Weighting: 1	Project supports and activity that makes a significant contribution to general fund (Greater than \$0.5 million per year average.	Project supports and activity that makes a normal contribution to general fund (<\$499,00) or will likely support a nominal increase in general fund revenues once constructed.	Project supports and activity that makes a nominal contribution to the general fund. (Less than \$99,000.	Project supports and activity that makes a moderate contribution to general fund.	Project supports and activity that makes a nominal/no contribution to general fund.
<b>11. Transportation alternatives and other factors not considered.</b>  Weighting: 2	No road and less than weekly ferry service to community, population 1,000 or less. Other factors.	No road and weekly ferry service to community, or population greater than 1,000. Other factors	Road connection or population greater than 3,000. Other factors	All factors considered.	All factors considered

*Total Weight = 33*